

**REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 9, 10 and 12-16 and 18-27 are now present in the application. Claims 9 and 27 are independent. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 9, 10, 12-16, 18, 20, 22 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei, U.S. Patent No. 5,682,043 (hereinafter Pei), in view of Wright, U.S. Patent No. 3,661,081 (hereinafter Wright), Shinoda et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,674,553 (hereinafter Shinoda), and Kimura et al., EP 0862156 (hereinafter Kimura); Ireton, U.S. Patent No. 4,611,539 was cited as evidence. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright, Shinoda and Kimura, and further in view of Mourrellone, U.S. Patent No. 4,542,693 (hereinafter Mourrellone). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright, Shinoda and Kimura, and further in view of Nagayama et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,701,055 (hereinafter Nagayama). Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright, Shinoda and Kimura, and further in view of Watanabe et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,270,846 (hereinafter Watanabe). Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pei in view of Wright, Shinoda and Kimura, and further in view of Samworth, U.S. Patent No. 6,213,018 (hereinafter Samworth). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Pei discloses printing composite material by flexographic printing. As provided by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action, “flexography” is defined as “a process of rotary letterpress printing using flexible plates and fast drying inks” and “letterpress” is defined as “the process of printing from an inked raised surface esp. when the paper is impressed directly on the surface.”

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Pei and Wright fail to teach forming barrier ribs. However, the Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Pei in view of Shinoda’s barriers 29 and Kimura’s interlevel insulation film 240. Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation to modify Pei’s flexographic printing with Shinoda’s barriers 29 and Kimura’s interlevel insulation film 240 because Shinoda’s barriers 29 and Kimura’s interlevel insulation film 240 would *interfere with Pei’s flexographic printing.*

As shown in Shinoda and Kimura, the material is deposited in an area between adjacent barriers or interlevel insulation films by screening printing (Shinoda) or direct injection (Kimura) to make sure that the material will be deposited into the pixel area defined by Shinoda’s barriers 29 and Kimura’s interlevel insulation film 240. However, by applying Shinoda’s barriers 29 and Kimura’s interlevel insulation film 240 to Pei’s flexographic printing, Shinoda’s barriers 29 and Kimura’s interlevel insulation film 240 may be in contact with the composite material on the rotary flexible plates during the flexographic printing process, which causes misplacement of the composite material. In other words, the composite material will not be precisely deposited at the desired locations (*i.e.*, pixel areas) and may be located at the *undesired* locations (*i.e.*, on top of

the barriers or interlevel insulation films) due to the interference of the barriers or interlevel insulation films with the rotary flexible plates.

Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 are used to define the pixel areas and to facilitate deposition of the material into the defined, desired areas by screening printing or direct injection. However, when applying them to Pei's flexographic printing, Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240 may interfere with the rotary flexible plates, thereby depositing the material *outside the defined, desired areas*, which is undesirable. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not have the motivation as suggested by the Examiner to modify Pei's flexographic printing in view of Shinoda's barriers 29 and Kimura's interlevel insulation film 240.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on the other secondary references, these references also fail to disclose the above-noted features as set forth in independent claims 9 and 27. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Pei.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the above-noted features of independent claims 9 and 27. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 27 and their dependent claims (at least due to their dependency) clearly define over the teachings of the utilized references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong  
Esther H. Chong  
Registration No.: 40,953  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant  
*ac*